

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 37-41 and 43-52.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's remaining objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claim 7 as being a duplicate of Claim 28.

Applicants respectfully disagree as Claims 7 and 28 are not duplicates as each is dependent on a different claim.

More specifically, Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 1 and Claim 28 is dependent on Claim 23. Claim 23 is narrower than Claim 1 as Claim 23 includes the limitation of "a light-absorbing multilayer film *including three layers formed of different materials*" (emphasis added). Claim 1 does not include the limitation in italics. These independent claims are different and patentably distinct. Accordingly, the claims dependent thereon are different. Hence, Claims 7 and 28 are not substantial duplicates.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 10, 12 and 53-57, 61 and 63 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Hamada (US 6,114,715). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Hamada teaches "a light-emitting device comprising: an anode as the first electrode (53 + 103)." However, "electrode 53" in Hamada is different than "anode 103." Electrode 53 is not an anode but a "source electrode." See

col. 8, line 19 in Hamada. Hence, Hamada treats 53 and 103 as separate electrodes and one skilled in the art reviewing the reference would also view them as two separate electrodes. Therefore, it is not proper to construe electrodes 53 and 103 as one electrode.

Further, if source electrode 53 is construed to be the first electrode, then Hamada fails to disclose or suggest the claimed feature of Claims 1 and 53 of “a layer comprising an organic compound formed over *and in contact* with the first electrode” (emphasis added), as layers 104-107 are not in contact with electrode 53.

Further, if anode 103 is considered to be the first electrode, then Hamada fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features of Claims 1 and 53 of “a first electrode formed over and in contact with the insulating film and connected to the thin film transistor through the insulating film;” and “a partition wall covering an edge of the first electrode and formed over the insulating film.”

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by Hamada, and Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Hamada. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 8, 11, 13-15, 59, 62 and 64-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 8, 11, 13-15, 59, 62 and 64-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Oda et al. (US 6,396,208). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Iwase et al. (US 6,768,534). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As explained above, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by Hamada. Iwase also does not disclose or suggest the features of Claims 1 and 53 discussed above (Iwase being cited by the Examiner for a different reason). Hence, even if it is proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest the device of independent Claims 1 and 53.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 (a second time) under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Iwase and in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al. (JP 2000-269473). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As explained above, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Hamada. Kaneda also does not disclose or suggest the features of Claim 1 discussed above (Kaneda being cited by the Examiner for a different reason). Hence, even if it is proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9

The Examiner also rejects Claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al. and Oda et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 23-27, 29 and 31-36

The Examiner also rejects Claims 23-27, 29 and 31-36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al.. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For similar reasons as discussed above for Claims 1 and 53, the claimed features of independent Claim 23 are also not disclosed or suggested by Hamada or Kaneda. Hence, even if it is proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 23.

Accordingly, independent Claim 23 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 30

The Examiner also rejects Claim 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al. and Oda et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are also adding new dependent Claims 67-70. These claims recite the feature of “wherein the first electrode comprises at least two layers.” This feature is supported by, for example, page 11, lines 15-20 of the specification of the present application.

As these are dependent claims, they are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If a fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered at this time and prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568